

March 15, 1983

LB 150

originally introduced. The Labeledz amendment does, in fact, allow for a specific procedure. It does require specific notification and as a matter of fact it does provide for an additional amount of control and in the formation of SIDs. When 150 was originally introduced, Douglas County said they were opposed to 150. Sarpy County said they were opposed to 150 and they have not taken a position other than opposing 150 as drawn. Now Papillion at first thought that 150 might be all right, but then they reconsidered when they saw really what it was and they said they have all the control that they need at the present time under existing law. So I am suggesting to you that it is not a necessary bill. It is not something that we ought to waste the time of this Legislature on just to give the planners more and more control. But if we are going to have something, the Labeledz amendment is an advance and perhaps a little improvement over what we have at the present time. So I would support the Labeledz amendment, and anything other than that I would oppose the bill if there will be any tightening up so that the planners can get their hands on another area where they can tell you and they can tell the citizens of the cities and the counties of this state what they can do and what they can't do. It seems to me that we are deluged with proposals by the planners that tell you, you must do this and you must do that, and we are at fault for passing the kinds of laws that 150 is which gives them this control which we really don't need. So I do support the Labeledz amendment but without the amendment I intend to oppose 150. Thank you.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Newell, did you wish to speak to this amendment?

SENATOR NEWELL: Mr. President and members of the body, the Labeledz amendment to LB 150 is a thinly disguised attempt to kill the bill. The problem with the minimum review requirements and the arguments that are presented on why we should have a review by the courts as opposed to the jurisdictions, either the city or the county, or in this case with LB 150 in its original form the county or the city only, is simply an issue of public policy and how we as a Legislature and how the state should operate when one uses public monies, uses the kinds of systems to provide municipal bonds with substantial reductions in tax... with tax benefits, et cetera. In every other segment, if you have to plan or zone, if you are inside the city limits, you have to go to that city zoning commission, have to get that approval, but the SID under Senator Labeledz's amendment would not. It would go to the courts with the very minimal sort of review process and would establish that kind